From:	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Sent:	4/3/2020 5:14:48 PM
To: Subject:	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) Fwd: MCAN issue - potentially needs elevation to management
oubject.	rwd. MCAN issue - potentially needs elevation to management
Did you	get this email on the CBI side?
Sent froi	n my iPhone
Begin fo	rwarded message:
F	rom: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
	ate: April 3, 2020 at 1:13:22 PM EDT
	o: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
C	C: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
S	ubject: Re: MCAN issue – potentially needs elevation to management
E	.s Personal Privacy (PP) should have been cc'd on it.
L	
S	ent from my iPhone
	;
	On Apr 2, 2020, at 9:57 PM Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) wrote:
	Thanks Ex & Pricesoul Price (1979)
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	if you are in tomorrow and were cc'd or Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) ase
	forward it to Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) I am off tomorrow and may not have ready
	access to my computer.
	Sent from my iPhone
	On Apr 2, 2020, at 7:55 PM, Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
	Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) wrote:
	<u> </u>
	I sent you a cbi email to let this one go through (for now).
	From Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
	Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2020 4:20 PM To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
	Subject: Fw: MCAN issue - potentially needs elevation to management
	<u> </u>
	Ex. 6 Provinces of Privinces of

I sent an email to you on the CBI side yesterday about this case. It has become a "hair on fire" case because the submitter appears to be willing to complain to senior mgmt. if we issue an incomplete letter. Please read the email below. I will try calling you.

From: Chen, Alice <Alice.Chen-1@dupont.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2020 11:16 AM
To: Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)
Cc: GRIECO, LIANE M <Liane.M.Grieco@dupont.com>

Subject: RE: Update on MCAN

Ex. 4 Personal Privacy (PP)

Would it be possible for EPA to provide a technical basis (e.g., literature citations) to substantiate their position that when an S. cerevisiae is crossed with another S. cerevisiae (both parents with taxonomic substantiation that is acknowledged by EPA) that the resulting progeny is not S. cerevisiae? We would be happy to provide several literature citations (likely in the thousands) to demonstrate that when two of the same species are mated, the same species results. Therefore, there is a technical position heavily supported by the scientific community that the GPY10145 will be S. cerevisiae, and that there is sufficient information provided in the MCAN for EPA to make this determination. Direct information on GPY10145 is therefore not needed in this case, although DuPont is communicating that we have direct evidence on GPY10145 that we working on to provide to EPA. In addition, we have information in the MCAN supporting through phenotypic characterization in Section 5.2.1 that the resulting new microorganisms behave like S. cerevisiae.

Would EPA like to have a call with our R&D team to understand how crosses between the same species results in the same species? Otherwise, if EPA moves forward with a decision to consider this submission incomplete, we will contact EPA upper management to discuss this issue as there is sufficient information in the MCAN to make the determination that the recipient strain is *S. cerevisiae*. Please let me know if you have any further concerns or questions.

Best regards, Alice

Alice Chen, Ph.D. Senior Manager for North America, Regulatory Affairs and Product Stewardship

<image001.png>
Danisco US Inc. | 925 Page Mill Road | Palo Alto, CA 94304

fige 650-846-5866 | fige 650-422-0356 | ⋈: alice.chen1@dupont.com

DuPont Nutrition and Biosciences